1	SNELL & WILMER			
2	Greg Brower (Nevada Bar No. 5232) Kelly Dove (Nevada Bar No. 10569)			
	3883 Howard Hughes Parkway			
3	Suite 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169			
4	Tel: (702) 784-5200			
5	Fax: (702) 784-5252 Email: gbrower@swlaw.com			
5	kdove@swlaw.com			
6	KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON L	тъ		
7	Steven D. Moore (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)	L		
0	Kristopher L. Reed (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)			
8	Christopher Schenck (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) 1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800			
9	Atlanta, GA 30309-4528			
10	Tel: (404) 815-6500 Fax: (404) 815-6555			
	Email: smoore@kilpatricktownsend.com			
11	kreed@kilpatricktownsend.com cschenck@kilpatricktownsend.com			
12	•			
13	Counsel for Defendants			
13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
14	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
15	2-WAY COMPUTING, INC. a Nevada			
16	corporation,			
10	Plaintiff,			
17	V.	Case No. 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-PAL		
18	SPRINT SOLUTIONS, INC., a Delaware			
10	corporation; NEXTEL FINANCE COMPANY, a Delaware corporation; SPRINT UNITED	DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED		
19	MANAGEMENT COMPANY, a Kansas	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE		
20	corporation; NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a Delaware corporation; NEXTEL BOOST OF	UNDER SEAL		
21	CALIFORNIA, LLC, a Delaware limited			
	liability company, and NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a Delaware			
22	corporation,			
23	Defendants.			
24	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM			
25				
26				

Pursuant to Local Rule 10-5 and Paragraph 9 of the Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. 39, Defendants Sprint Solutions, Inc., Nextel Finance Company, Sprint United Management Company, Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel Boost of California, LLC, and Nextel Communications, Inc. (collectively, "Sprint") hereby request that portions of its Omnibus Motion *In Limine* and Exhibits B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and J thereto, which will be electronically filed under seal contemporaneously with this request, be sealed by this Honorable Court. This Motion for Leave is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the papers and pleadings on file, and any oral argument the Court may entertain. Additionally, counsel for Sprint has conferred with counsel for Plaintiff who indicated that the Plaintiff will not oppose the current Motion.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

On May 20, 2011, the Court entered the parties' Stipulated Protective Order. *See* Dkt. 39. On May 24, 2012, the Court entered a Stipulation for Amendment to Stipulated Protective Order. *See* Dkt. 99. The Stipulated Protective Order allowed for the production of documents and information that contain technical or business information of a competitive significance. Dkt. 39 at ¶6. The Stipulated Protective Order also protected non-parties that provided confidential documents and/or information in the case. *Id.* at ¶15. Under the protective order, the parties, as well as non-parties such as Motorola Mobility, Motorola Solutions, and Qualcomm, produced documents, provided information during discovery, and permitted the parties to produce information and documents subject to confidentiality restrictions. Much of this information was designated as "Confidential" in accordance with the provisions in the Stipulated Protective Order as the information involved proprietary technical information with respect to the iDEN technology at issue.

Previously in this matter, Sprint filed two Motions for Summary Judgment and replies in support of those Motions. Both of those Motions involved materials that either the parties, or non-parties, deemed "Confidential" under the Stipulated Protective Order, including materials concerning how iDEN, and devices that use iDEN, operate. Thus, under paragraph

9 of the Stipulated Protective Order, Sprint filed a motion to seal certain materials involved in

those Motions for Summary Judgment illustrating that "compelling reasons" existed for such

materials to remain under seal. See Dkts. 140, 156. The Court granted those Motions. See

Dkts. 157, 159. In granting those Motions to Seal, the Court found that "Defendants have

stated compelling reasons for maintaining the confidentiality of documents filed in

connection with their Motions for Summary Judgment." Dkt. 157 at 2. See also Dkt. 159 at

1; Dkt. 212.

II. <u>LEGAL ARGUMENT AND ANALYSIS</u>

The documents filed under seal should remain sealed because they contain confidential information and trade secrets regarding the technology at issue. In the case of dispositive motions, in which similar, if not the same, materials were deemed to remain under seal by this Court, *see* Dkts. 157, 159, "compelling reasons" must be shown in order to seal the records. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006). As described above, the Court found that the "compelling reasons" test was met to maintain under seal documents relating to the iDEN technology at issue.

The information Sprint seeks to maintain under seal here meets the "compelling reasons" test. Documents relating to the development and operation of iDEN are clearly proprietary and subject to protection. Another district court, in conjunction with a theft of trade secrets case involving documents concerning iDEN technology, made specific findings of fact that the iDEN technology is proprietary and not readily available to the public. *See U.S. v. Hanjuan Jin*, 833 F. Supp. 2d 977, 982, 991 (N.D. Ill. 2012) ("iDEN is a proprietary standard for cellular telecommunications technology developed by Motorola [and] is not publicly accessible."). Maintaining the confidentiality of such technology is essential to not only third parties that developed the technology such as Motorola Solutions and Motorola Mobility, but also the companies that have contracted with these companies to use the technology and have agreed to maintain its confidentiality, such as Sprint. In fact, the Court

¹ The agreements with these companies contain non-disclosure and confidentiality obligations.

filed its Order on the Motion for Summary Judgment involving the iDEN technology at issue under seal. *See* Dkt. 160.

The redactions to Sprint's Omnibus Motion *In Limine* and certain Exhibits thereto relate to (1) the functionality of the proprietary iDEN technology, how iDEN devices that use such technology operate, and the development of the iDEN technology, and thus should be maintained under seal, and (2) competitive financial information. The information has been designated as "Confidential" under the Stipulated Protective Order because the producing party considers the information to be proprietary and subject to protection. The Court's prior orders with respect to the Motions to Seal in conjunction with the Motions for Summary Judgment and previous motions *in limine*, *see*, *e.g.*, Dkt. 157, 159, 212, as well as the Order from the Northern District of Illinois discussed above, illustrate that Sprint has made the requisite particularized showing of good cause with respect to these documents.

Due to the confidential, proprietary, and private nature of these documents and information, public disclosure could result in improper use and could put not only Defendant Sprint, but also non-parties Motorola Mobility, LLC and Motorola Solutions, Inc. at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace. Furthermore, the public has little to no interest in these documents and information in the context of this patent litigation matter brought by a non-practicing entity. Considering the information at issue, there is comparatively little value to the general public in terms of enhancing its "understanding of the judicial process." *See Kamakana*, 447. F.3d at 1179. Simply put, there is no harm to the public if they do not have access to the information Sprint seeks to seal. Therefore, this Court should enter an order to seal the documents and information and not place it on the Court's docket.

III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

Because Sprint's Omnibus Motion *In Limine* and certain Exhibits contains confidential information and trade secrets regarding the technology used by Sprint for Pushto-Talk that is at issue in this patent infringement lawsuit, and that Plaintiff does not oppose the current Motion, Sprint respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order that these materials remain sealed.

1	Dated: July 24, 2015	Respectfully submitted,
2		KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
3		STOCKTON LLI
4		s/Christopher Schenck
5		Christopher Schenck (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)
6		cschenck@kilpatricktownsend.com
7		1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4400 Seattle, WA 98101
/		Tel: (206) 467-9600
8		Fax: (206) 623-6793
9		Steven D. Moore (Pro Hac Vice)
10		smoore@kilpatricktownsend.com
1.1		Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, CA 94111
11		Tel: (415) 576-0200
12		Fax: (415) 576-0300
13		Kristopher L. Reed (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)
14		kreed@kilpatricktownsend.com
17		1400 Wewatta Street, Suite 600
15		Denver, CO 80202 Tel: (303) 571-4000
16		Fax: (303) 571-4000
17		
		SNELL & WILMER LLP
18		Greg Brower (Nevada Bar No. 5232)
19		gbrower@swlaw.com
20		Kelly Dove (Nevada Bar No. 10569) kdove@swlaw.com
		3883 Howard Hughes Parkway
21		Suite 1100
22		Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Tel: (702) 784-5200
23		Fax: (702) 784-5252
24		Counsel for Defendants
25		Sprint Solutions, Inc., Nextel Finance
26		Company, Sprint United Management Company, Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel
		Boost of California, LLC, and Nextel
27		Communications, Inc.
28		

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury, that I am over the age of eighteen 3 (18) years. On this date, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL by 4 5 the method indicated: by the Court's CM/ECF Program 6 XXX 7 by U. S. Mail 8 by Facsimile Transmission 9 by Electronic Mail 10 by Federal Express 11 by Hand Delivery 12 13 Mark Borghese, Esq. Reza Mirzaie **BORGHESE LEGAL, LTD.** Marc A. Fenster 14 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150 Adam S. Hoffman Las Vegas, NV 89145 Jay Chung 15 Shani M. Tutt Tel: (702) 382-4804 (702) 382-4805 Fax: Brian D. Ledahl 16 Email: mark@borgheselegal.com **RUSS AUGUST & KABAT** 17 12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025 Counsel for Plaintiff 18 2-Way Computing, Inc. (310) 826-7474 Tel: (310) 826-6991 Fax: 19 Email: rmirzaie@raklaw.com Email: mfenster@raklaw.com 20 Email: ahoffman@raklaw.com 21 Email: jchung@raklaw.com Email: stutt@raklaw.com 22 Email bledahl@raklaw.com 23 Counsel for Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc. 24 25 26 DATED: July 24, 2015 s/Christopher Schenck Christopher Schenck (*Pro Hac Vice*) 27 28

Attorneys for Defendants

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

2-WAY COMPUTING, Inc. a Nevada corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SPRINT SOLUTIONS, INC., a Delaware

corporation; NEXTEL FINANCE COMPANY, a Delaware corporation; SPRINT UNITED

MANAGEMENT COMPANY, a Kansas

corporation; NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a

Delaware corporation; NEXTEL BOOST OF

CALIFORNIA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS.

INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM

Case No. 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-PAL

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL

Case 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-PAL Document 294 Filed 08/20/15 Page 8 of 8

1				
1	The C	Court, having reviewed Defendants' Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Under Seal		
2	and good car	od cause appearing, hereby ORDERS that the following documents can be filed under seal:		
3	1.	The unredacted version of Defendants' Omnibus Motion In Limine; and		
4	2.	Exhibits B-H and J to the Declaration of Christopher Schenck in Support of		
5	Defendants' Omnibus Motion In Limine.			
6				
7	DATED this	19th day of August, 2015.		
8		THE PEGGY A. LEEN		
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
/ X				